



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

study has reached its legitimate culmination, the style of the biblical writings must be treated with as much fulness as is now given to literary analysis. It is just possible that this type of study, carried on as it should be, will temper the absurd extremes of literary analysis which are sometimes presented to the public.

The two German commentaries have their own excellences. The brevity of Dr. Holzinger has its advantage in not overloading the discussion. It has the disadvantage of leaving out subjects which one is anxious to find. This is the disadvantage which comes from the theory of the series of commentaries of which this is a part. The chief excellence seems to be the collection of material for textual criticism. The work of Dr. Baentsch is fuller, and more diverse from that of Dr. Gray; and it is therefore adapted to supplement the English commentary. The present writer is not sure that either of the two is as good as Dillmann's.

F. B. DENIO.

BANGOR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Bangor, Me.

EUSEBIUS—CHURCH FATHER, HISTORIAN, AND APOLOGIST.

THE year 1903 has honored Eusebius with editions of two of his works, each in the first rank of importance or interest.¹ Schwartz's edition of the *Church History*, of which the text of the first five books has appeared, undoubtedly fills the long and strongly felt need for an adequate text; but critical examination of this must wait on the appearance of the *Prolegomena*.

Gifford's edition of the *Preparation for the Gospel* comes complete, text, translation, and notes—two stout volumes each of text and translation, and one of notes, some 2,700 pages in all, and gotten out in the best style of the Oxford University Press, in a convenient octavo size, neat cloth-binding, and admirable choice of type for the distinction between the text of Eusebius and the many excerpts from other works which form so large a part of the *Preparation* and are the characteristic element of the method of the work.

¹ *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae praeparationis libri XV*, ad codices manuscriptos denuo collatos recensuit, anglice nunc primum reddidit, notis et indicibus instruxit E. H. GIFFORD. Oxonii: E Typographeo Academico, 1903, 4 vols. in 5.

Eusebius' Werke. Zweiter Band. *Die Kirchengeschichte*. Bearbeitet im Auftrage der Kirchenväter-Commission der königl. preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften von EDUARD SCHWARTZ. Die lateinische Uebersetzung des Rufinus, bearbeitet im gleichen Auftrage von THEODOR MOMMSEN. Erste Hälfte. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903. 507 pages.

The text, though in some sense an afterthought of the editor, and not a contribution in any such sense as the new text of the *Church History*, is an advance on previous texts, and is most welcome as putting the work in a convenient and accessible form. The notes are well judged and abundant, and the scholarship adequate, although there is a curious reflection of Eusebius's own habit in the inveterate use of quotation. The most important contribution of the work is, however, the translation. This is, in the first place, a *princeps* "nunc primum reddidit." Moreover, this was the editor's starting-point and first love, and it is for this that he (however well equipped for the rest) is best equipped. The translation of the *Preparation* is a task of peculiar difficulty on account of the immense variety of styles involved, and the lack of help from previous translations, of which there are few in any language. The work of the translator here gives the impression of high linguistic competence for this task, both as regards his command of the Greek and the flexibility of the English.

The introduction to the translation and the preface to the text, although more full than large, throw some light on the life of Eusebius in general and on this work in particular, while the excellent indices to all three parts are of greater importance still for the study of the *Preparation*.

Thanks to this full apparatus of text, translation, notes, introduction, and indices, both students and laymen are now in a far better position to appreciate the work than ever before.

The *Preparation for the Gospel* consists of fifteen books directed against the double charge that the Christian Greeks are leaving their native gods and are taking up with the doctrine of the barbarians. It is intended, first of all, to clear away objections, and especially to set right those who think that Christianity demands "an unreasoning faith and an assent without examination," an "uncritical and untested faith." It is written with the intention of "suiting itself to our recent converts from among the heathen"—possibly, therefore, for students of the alleged theological school in the house of Pamphilus.

In the first three books the author treats of two forms of the Greek theology—first the mythical or poetical, and then the physical or speculative or philosophical. He then passes on, in the fourth book, to treat of political or state religion, in particular the oracles and worship of demons, refuting these by showing the intrinsic wickedness of the system, and passing on in Book VI to refute again on the ground of the falsity of their oracles. Discussing the oracles and the doctrine of fate, he reaches the conclusion that the so-called oracles are not gods, or even good demons,

but a set of jugglers, cheats, and deceivers. Having here finished with the Greek, he passes to the Hebrew, with intent to show that in borrowing from the barbarians, and from the Hebrews in particular, the Christians are acting with good judgment, in view of the excellence of the opinion and manner of life of those of whom they borrow, as testified to even by the Greeks, and are doing nothing more nor less than the best of the Greek philosophers have already done. He makes a special point, in very extended treatment, of the accord between Plato and the Scriptures, as well as of his differences from them; and then passes on to the other philosophers, and to one of his favorite arguments—the differences of opinion of the philosophers among themselves.

At the beginning or the end of most of the books is a summary of what immediately precedes. In the fifteenth book is a complete summary of all that precedes.

A good clue to the understanding of Eusebius's treatment of his subject is found in the special audience (*i. e.*, recent Greek converts) for which the work is intended. The *Preparation for the Gospel* and the *Demonstration of the Gospel* are complements of one another, and form one work. The two portions correspond to what had become the conventional encyclopædic division of the early apologetics, "Against the Greeks" and "Against the Jews." The early Christians were facing two systems—the heathen, wholly outside and rejected; and the Hebrew, accepted in substance and spirit, but rejected in part as to form. The familiar question of the Greek was: "Why leave the doctrine of our fathers and take up with the barbarian Hebrew doctrines?" This is answered in the *Preparation*. The question of the Jew was: "Why, if you accept so much, do you not accept all?" Against this the argument of the *Demonstration* was directed, but the work being intended rather for heathen than for Jewish converts, the method is altered accordingly, as it is also in the *Preparation*. It is intended rather to confirm than to convert; to cultivate intelligence of faith and equip for controversy rather than to controvert.

To this end the two characteristic features of Eusebius's method are well adapted—the convicting of adversaries out of their own mouths by long quotations from their own writers, and the discovery of contradictions between the writers themselves. This discovery of disagreement is a favorite proof with him, as with many modern apologists in the warfare with science; but here, as always, it is weak, save as a reply to the charge of differences among the Christians themselves. Differences do not prove that both are wrong.

The method of quotation, on the other hand, is always at least as forcible as the arguments quoted, and has besides a definite rhetorical influence. It is this use of quotation, which belongs to the *Church History* as well as to the *Preparation*, which is the most effective element of Eusebius's style, and which, quite accidentally, gives the greatest value to his work; for, whatever may be said of the value of his contributions in his own language, neither they nor the work as a whole can be compared in importance with the quotations. This is accidental and comes from the fact that so many of these passages are nowhere else preserved. If they were all extant elsewhere, the relative value would be quite different.

The *Preparation* is almost a better example of Eusebius's method of quotation than the *Church History* itself. It contains some 475 excerpts from more than fifty writers, and twice that number of works. It contains extracts from nearly forty works preserved to us only by Eusebius. These include fragments of Euripides, Pindar, and the Orphic Hymns, from Sanchuniathon, Alexander Polyhistor, Philo, Julius Africanus, Plutarch, Porphyry, Aristocles, Numenius, Atticus, and many others. To have preserved the much-discussed fragment of Sanchuniathon, and the sarcastic and delightful Ænomaus, alone would be enough to give distinction to any work, and the writings of Porphyry, against whom the work seems to be specially aimed, alone would be an invaluable contribution to a knowledge of the spirit of the time.

But, however accidental the great importance of the work through the loss of the originals from which the extracts were made, the inclusion of the extracts themselves was no accident. It was the result of the author's most deliberate and characteristic method. The reason for the method is perhaps to be found in the fact that he was a librarian. Whether he would be counted a professional or not, he was at least *de facto* librarian in the remarkable library of Pamphilus. His method of gathering and organizing great excerpts from other writers, rather than expressing in his own language, is the librarian's instinct for gathering the best that has been written on any topic in order to guide his readers. It is as if one of the theological students in the house of Pamphilus had asked him the best thing to read on each topic. It is the habit which makes it natural that Mr. Garnett should write an *Anthology*, or Mr. Larned a *History for Ready Reference*. The wide sweep of field and organizing of material into a unified work is the spirit of Mr. Winsor's co-operative historical writing. It is a mistake to suppose that this use of excerpts is necessarily mechanical and without originality. It takes no mean type of genius to

be able to put the finger on just the thing which best points the moral and adorns the tale; and this is a genius which Eusebius had in a superlative degree. Moreover, the very weaving of the more or less heterogeneous fragments into a homogeneous whole is a matter which requires a great amount of constructive energy.

But the quotations themselves and the skilful use of them are by no means the only merits of the work. It is noteworthy for the topics discussed and for the spirit in which they are taken up. This at least. The discussions of the oracles, of fate, of the Logos (in spite of his doctrine of the second God), of the Platonic philosophy, and of the Essenes are types of the many topics which are of permanent interest and importance. The discussion on human sacrifice is a perfect thesaurus of usages, invaluable to the modern student of the subject; and that on the interpretation of the philosophy expressed in myths should be of great value to the new psychology. Some of the live matters then are surprisingly alive today; what could be more so than the following:

For my part indeed I say that the man who asserts that the parts of the world are parts of God is guilty of the utmost impiety, and still more he who declared that God is the same as the world, and besides these the man who thinks that the Creator of the universe is the mind of the world.

It is rather the fashion to speak slightly of Eusebius's style. Gifford is no exception to this rule, and he speaks of Eusebius as an editor or compiler, rather than an original writer, and of his style as awkward and unattractive, though simple and unaffected; but he justly takes issue with Bishop Lightfoot's criticism of the arrangement, and traces the orderly and very comprehensive plan. But certainly simplicity and unaffectedness lie near the very roots of good style.

The spirit in which Eusebius writes is most delightful, as may be seen from the following quotations, taken from near the beginning, middle, and end of his work. Defining religion, he says:

Now, the chief of these blessings must be religion . . . and this consists in looking up to . . . the One and Only God; and in the kindling of the life after God, wherein friendship also with him is engendered.

His attitude toward his work appears where he says:

We will pass on to the eighth book . . . and, after invoking the help of God, etc.

Finally, we have a sort of confession of faith in:

We . . . cling solely to piety toward God, the Creator of all things, and, by a life of temperance and all godly behavior according to virtue, strive to live in a manner pleasing to him who is God over all.

The time of publication of the *Preparation* is a much-discussed question, carefully considered by the editor, who finds that some of it was certainly written after 314, and some of it probably not later than 312. He concludes, therefore, that it was begun about 312, "but not finished till a few years after." Besides this discussion of date, there are in the introduction discussions on the occasion, method, style, and contents of the work, a very important study of the quotations, and a very interesting study of the relationship of Eusebius to Pamphilus, in which the author comes to the conclusion that Eusebius was quite possibly the legally adopted son of Pamphilus, adopted in order to make him heir.

It has been said that Gifford's work on the text is inferior to that on the translation, but yet a contribution. The three manuscripts which he rightly accepts as his main basis have been wholly recollated for him by various hands. He also has the use of Heikel's work, and follows him pretty closely. He, moreover, discusses the relations of the manuscripts to some purpose, and uses texts of the authors included with some effect. In his discussions he comes out (with Heikel) on the ground that A H and B I O are parallel groups, but he regards A H as representing the better transcription, while Heikel counts one as good as the other. He applies his evidence on this basis with good use of his linguistic knowledge, and the result is undoubtedly an improved text. Without attempting to go into discussions which would require an examination of all his readings, it must be said that the very method of discussing the evidence of the manuscripts rouses the suspicion, which a study of the various readings confirms, that the editor does not make the most of the possibilities of the genealogical method. In the first place, he presents no table of the manuscripts. It is safe to say that the table which, following Heikel, Harnack prints in his *Altchristliche Literaturgeschichte* is worth, in itself, more than all Gifford's discussion in the Prolegomena for a study of the various readings, to most students. This table shows agreement with Gifford in the putting of A H and B I O as parallel groups, but it reveals also the fact that a consensus of B D as against I is final in Books I and II, and that of B I or O I final as against O or B respectively in Books III–XV, B and O together being equal to I. Now, as A H cover only the first five books, the evidence of the later books is restricted to B I O. Taking several passages from Josephus and Clement in the later books, it is found that there are eleven places in which the author rejects the reading of I O. This means that either the table needs revision, or that Gifford's method is too eclectic; and, since B O is discarded in seven cases and the readings of the originals are not decisive, it would seem that the latter is the case. This could be justified only by the demonstration

that there had been much intercorrection by scribes, but the editor has not even attempted to show this, save in the matter of the text of Plato and A. This applies therefore only to the first five books (since A contains but five), and it is not probable that there was much intercorrection of B I O, save possibly in Books I and II of I.

The text, in brief, falls a little short of the ideal in the matter of collations, and still farther in satisfactoriness of discussion; but it must be repeated that it is a real contribution, and extremely welcome, apart from its practical convenience, for its apparatus of various readings.

The prolegomena to the text also falls somewhat short from the bibliographical point of view. Of manuscripts only the eleven which the editor regards as of possible value are even enumerated, although Heikel names nearly twenty and Harnack-Preuschen gathers up various others. There is no effort to add to this list. In the enumeration of translations, there is only one edition of the Latin of George of Trebizond—the 1470 edition mentioned on the authority of Fabricius. There are, in fact, not less than a dozen. The large number of editions of the Latin translations before the end of the sixteenth century (1470, 1473, 1476, 1480, 1491, 1494, 1497, 1500, 1501, 1522, 1534, 1539, 1542, 1559, 1570, 1581) is a fact of significance of which Gifford makes no mention. Nor does he seem to know of the Italian translation (Venice, 1549), or of the selections published in English and German. It would be captious to the last degree to lay stress on matters of such minor importance; and with these small qualifications the work is to be welcomed as of the most useful and most scholarly character.

ERNEST CUSHING RICHARDSON.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
Princeton, N. J.

THE DOCTRINE OF SIN.

TWO RECENT volumes¹ by Mr. F. R. Tennant constitute an important contribution to the study of a subject to which the historical and critical method has been as yet but sparingly applied. The first of the volumes named is composed of four Hulsean Lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge in 1901-2. In these discourses the author traversed the views hitherto prevalent concerning the doctrines of the fall and original sin, pointed out how small a place they hold in the Bible compared with

¹ *The Origin and Propagation of Sin.* By F. R. TENNANT. Cambridge: University Press; New York, Macmillan, 1902. 232 pages.

The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin. By F. R. TENNANT. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1903. 362 pages.